



United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
National Center for Preservation Technology and Training

Lee H. Nelson Hall  
645 University Parkway  
Natchitoches, Louisiana 71457  
[www.ncptt.nps.gov](http://www.ncptt.nps.gov)



**DRAFT**

**National Center for Preservation Technology & Training  
National Park Service**

**Conference Room  
Lee H. Nelson Hall  
Northwestern State University of Louisiana  
Natchitoches, La.**

**March 29, 2005**

**MINUTES  
PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGY & TRAINING BOARD**

**Preservation Technology & Training Board Members Present:** Mr. Roy Eugene Graham (Chair), Mr. Lou Gallegos, Dr. James Garrison, Ms. Suzanne Lewis, Mr. Norman Koonce, Dr. Frank Preusser, Mr. Robert Silman (Vice Chair), Mr. de Teel Patterson Tiller (Designated Federal Officer), Ms. Suzanne Turner, Mr. Norman Weiss

**Board Members Present by Conference Call:** Ms. Patricia O'Donnell

**Board Members Absent:** Mr. Horace Foxall, Dr. Judith Bense

**Northwestern State University of Louisiana Representative:** Dr. Kathleen Byrd

**National Center for Preservation Technology & Training Staff:** Mr. Kirk Cordell, (Executive Director), Mr. Kevin Ammons, Ms. Kim Bowen, Mr. Sean Clifford, Mr. Andrew Ferrell, Mr. Jeffery Guin, Mr. Andrew Jacob, Dr. David Morgan, Dr. Mary Striegel

**Cane River National Heritage Area Representative:** Dr. Nancy Morgan,

**Cane River National Heritage Area Commission Representative:** Ms. Sadie Newell

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Graham called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM

**Introductions of New Board Members.** Chair Graham introduced the newly appointed Board members including Dr. James Garrison, Ms. Suzanne Lewis, and Ms. Suzanne Turner.

**Certification of the meeting.** Chair Graham asked Mr. de Teel Patterson Tiller, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), to certify the meeting. Mr. Tiller informed the Preservation Technology & Training Board (the Board) that the meeting had been announced in the Federal Register as required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (43 CFR Part 102-3.150 (a)). Mr. Tiller took a moment to commend Ms. Martha Graham for her past efforts on behalf the Board in seeing that the meeting was properly advertised. He certified the meeting and said that a quorum was present in compliance with the Board's by-laws and charter.

**Welcome.** Mr. Kirk Cordell welcomed the members of the Board and discussed logistics for the meeting, lunch, and dinner.

**Approval of the Minutes.** Chair Graham asked for a motion to approve the minutes for the Fall 2004 Board meeting. Dr. Frank Preusser made the motion and Mr. Norman Weiss seconded it. **The motion passed unanimously.**

**Elections.** Chair Graham entertained nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Board. Chair Graham nominated Ms. Suzanne Lewis for the position and Ms. Turner seconded the nomination. **Ms. Lewis accepted the nomination and was elected by a unanimous vote.**

Chair Graham nominated Vice Chair Robert Silman for the position of Chair of the Board and Dr. Preusser seconded the nomination. Vice Chair Silman accepted the nomination and was elected by a unanimous vote.

**Board Appointments.** Mr. Tiller led a discussion of the appointment process with the Board. The process can be a lengthy one, usually taking anywhere from nine months to two years. The Board reviewed a handout of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470, Section 404). From the description in Sec. 404 (c), there are thirteen members on the Board. Six members are designated to represent federal, state, and local agencies. An additional six members are to represent major organizations in the fields of archeology, architecture, conservation, curation, engineering, history, historic preservation, and landscape architecture. Mr. Tiller recommended that a matrix be created that shows how the current Board members fulfill the requirements of the legislation. When new Board members are nominated they will be chosen carefully so as to fill any gaps in representation.

Historically, the Board has been composed of twelve members and the DFO has served as the Secretary's Designee to the Board. Current interpretation of the legislation requires that the DFO and the Secretary's Designee be two separate members on the Board. The addition of a new Board member must be addressed. Additionally, the Board may wish to consider extensions of the terms of current Board members scheduled to rotate off the Board this year. Dr. Preusser emphasized the need for continuity and opportunities for transition that may be lost without the extension of some Board members' terms. Newly elected Chair Silman queried Board members Mr. Koonce, Mr. Gallegos, and Mr. Graham to determine their desire to continue on the Board. Mr. Koonce and Mr. Graham expressed desire to have their terms extended. Mr. Gallegos indicated that he did not wish to continue on the Board after the end of his current term.

Based on this determination, Chair Silman indicated that the Board would request the extension of Mr. Koonce and Mr. Graham and would identify at least four recommendations for the appointment of two new Board members.

## **STATE OF NCPTT.**

Mr. Cordell reported that this Board meeting marked a departure in format. In the past, three to four hours of the meeting were used to allow staff to report on NCPTT's activities and accomplishments. The information presented was provided to the Board in the notebooks sent prior to the meeting. Starting with this meeting, a brief overview of NCPTT activities will be presented followed by an extended period of time to allow for Board discussion on pertinent issues.

Mr. Cordell reported that the state of the Center was good. There was strong progress in all areas. Through his efforts and the efforts of others over the course of 18 months, new Board members were appointed.

**NCPTT Staffing.** Mr. Cordell announced that the Center was able to fill two long-vacant manager positions and an associate position. He indicated that many delays were a result of budget crises that NCPTT has experienced in recent years. He introduced Dr. David Morgan, who filled the Archeology and Collections Program manager position. He announced that Mr. Andrew Ferrell, formerly an NCPTT Associate, was selected to fill the Architecture and Engineering Program manager position. Mr. Jason Church was selected to fill the Materials Research Program Associate position and would begin by April 1, 2005.

NCPTT is waiting for FY05 final budget approval before advertising the Heritage Education Manager position. But no action will be taken with the Historic Landscapes Program manager until the FY06 budget issues are resolved.

**Budget.** In the President's 2006 budget, the annual federal appropriation for NCPTT was zero. The morale of the staff is affected by this budget crisis, but they continue to work hard and deliver valuable products.

Mr. Cordell indicated the FY05 NCPTT budget is flat again this year. He reviewed the projected expenses for this year and noted that the Materials Research Program has brought in outside income for mission related research from both the General Services Administration and the Department of Veteran Affairs National Cemetery Administration.

Ms. O'Donnell noted funding for the Corneal Imaging Project within the budget and wished to learn more about the project. She also commended Mary Striegel for the added research income and noted that these actions follow on the Board's recommendations and recommendations of the Business Plan. She suggested a need for a strategy to gain more external funding.

**Business Plan.** The Center continues to implement recommendations and data from the Business Plan. The Cemetery Monument Conservation (CMC) Workshops are being conducted on a cost recovery model. Fee structures for the CMC workshop and the Architecture and Engineering Summer Institute are derived from data in the Business Plan.

**2004 Annual Report.** Mr. Cordell provided the Board members with a draft of the 2004 annual report. He proposed that the 2003 and the 2004 annual reports be mailed out together. The Board discussed who should receive the reports in addition to the President and Congress. Mr. Graham suggested that the Center may get more coverage by mailing the 2003 and 2004 reports separately. The consensus of the Board was that the reports should be mailed out approximately 3 months apart. They should be sent to the Congress, the President, the Vice-President, and each of the committee and subcommittee chairs. A hardcopy should be sent with a personal note from Judge Manson. Some suggested that electronic versions of the report could be more widely distributed to include groups like the newly formed Congressional Caucus on Preservation, Preservation Action, the Advisory Council on Historic



Preservation, and professional organizations such as the Association for Preservation Technology (APT), the American Institute for Conservation (AIC), the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, American Society for Landscape Architects (ASLA), and others. NCPTT will send out e-mail notices about the availability of the annual reports and post the reports on our website as well.

**PTT Grants Program.** Mr. Cordell reported that the grant application process continues to improve. This is the Center's third year using an on-line application process. Thanks to the work of Sean Clifford, Mary Striegel, and Andy Ferrell, the paperless process has been revamped. Over 65 completed applications were received requesting funding of over \$2 million. The Center is convening a national panel to review the applications and make recommendations on April 12, 2005. Mr. Cordell requested the participation of a Board representative on the panel. Mr. Preusser volunteered and was appointed as the Board representative.

**Knowledge Center.** The Center is redesigning its web site and preparing to roll out the knowledge portal, Mr. Cordell reported to the Board. There is a new web-based forum for Board member use, as well. New updated servers and software have been installed. A TELnet satellite-based system has been installed for use with NPS training. NCPTT will house the GIS data for the Cane River National Heritage Area, and will establish four workstations in addition to hosting 1.2 GB of data. Also, NCPTT has sent out over 143 publications by mail in the first and second quarters of FY 2005. This marks a 15% increase over 2004.

**Product Catalog.** Following recommendations from the business plan, NCPTT has developed a product catalog that is ready to hand out at professional meetings. The catalog will be posted on-line as well. Dr. Preusser asked about the cost recovery on the products and Mr. Cordell pointed out that NCPTT currently does not have a good mechanism to receive money from the general public. Ms. Lewis suggested that a nearby CESU might be able to assist NCPTT with funds.

**Logo Development.** NCPTT continues to follow the NPS imaging guidelines established by NPS. In addition, the Center has developed a logo for NCPTT that will be used in publications, etc. It is hoped this will give the Center increased visibility at professional meetings and in print.

**Summer Institute.** NCPTT's Second Annual Summer Institute is planned for June 14-24, 2005. Two week-long courses, "Historic Materials and Building Pathology" and "Diagnostic Methodology and Treatment Strategies," will be taught.

**Landscape Architecture of Nelson Hall.** The Cultural Landscape Report for Nelson Hall and its surrounds is 95% complete. However, the available funding is too small to cover the costs of the work. The Board expressed some concern over the report. Mr. Garrison asked if the Louisiana SHPO office had received the report and commented on it. Some on the Board questioned the proposed period of significance. Ms. Turner and Ms. O'Donnell volunteered to review the report and assist the Center in identifying appropriate landscape architects who might be able to bring the plan to fruition.

**Architecture and Engineering Program.** NCPTT is partnering with the Athenaeum of Philadelphia to publish Charlie Peterson's papers on Concrete materials. NCPTT is also

partnering with AIA/HRC to host a symposium on the integration of historic preservation into undergraduate architecture curriculum nationwide. Also, the A&E program is beginning an initiative on sustainable approaches to historic preservation.

**Materials Research Program.** NCPTT's Materials Research Program (MRP) continues with several research and training activities. In partnership with the General Services Administration (GSA), which is funding the \$85,000 project, the MRP is studying vitrification as an appropriate treatment for historic terrazzo flooring found in the Milwaukee Federal Building. A preliminary report was recently submitted to GSA. The project is slated for completion in June 2005. The study of air pollution deposition on consolidated stone is nearly complete and awaiting repair of the environmental exposure chamber. A new motor for the chamber was received yesterday. A related project is the development of alkoxygermanes as potential stone consolidants. This joint project with NSU is in the final stages but requires the exposure chamber for completion. The MRP has added new equipment to the research facility including a BYK Gardner micro-Tri-gloss meter and a Thermo digital pH/ion selective meter.

MRP continues its successful Cemetery Monument Conservation Workshop series, with the third workshop planned for May 24-26, 2005 in Omaha, Nebraska. Partners include the NPS Midwest regional office, the Gerald R. Ford Conservation Center and Prospect Hill Cemetery. A short promotional DVD has been developed for the cemetery monument training events.

NCPTT also was a co-sponsor for the International Building Lime Conference held in Orlando Florida in March 2005.

**Heritage Education – Louisiana.** This program has no additional funding, but received an earmark of \$98,600 to be distributed as grants. The call for proposals this year brought in over 90 applications. The program is continuing its teachers workshops with a 2005 theme of "historic Courthouses." The quarterly newsletter is still being published as well.

**Partners.** NSU is starting a new graduate program, a Masters of Arts in Heritage Resources, to begin in the fall. The Center expects to host interns from the program. Also, NCPTT currently hosts 12 interns from the Louisiana School for Math, Science and the Arts, a selective residential high school that brings in the top students from around the state.

### ***CRISIS – IS THE CENTER IN ONE?***

**Board's View and Definition of Crisis.** Mr. Graham and Chair Silman led a discussion of the PTTBoard regarding the current status of NCPTT within the National Park Service. Chair Silman noted that a financial review was presented at yesterday's new Board member orientation. In particular, Silman pointed out, the Center's budget was zeroed out of the President's budget in the last three years. Do these decisions come from NPS?

The zeroing out paralyzes NCPTT and creates a difficult work situation. The financial difficulties are seen annually and may be tied to the Administration. Within the President's Budget, NCPTT's 2006 line item is zero. The Green Book states that NCPTT is proposed for closure because it is a non-federal program and NPS will fund higher federal priorities. This is likely a visibility issue for



the Center. It was noted that there is a strong commitment by the NPS director to continue NCPTT. Reductions and removal of NCPTT likely occurred at a higher level, but no one is sure where. Board members stressed that NPS is not aware of the value of the Center to the core organization. They were also surprised at the Green Book language which indicated that NCPTT was a non-federal program. Is the Center being confused with other organizations such as the National Preservation Institute? NCPTT is a federally legislated program.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that many of the issues facing NCPTT are not financial in nature but more likely related to questions of A76 (referring to the Management and Budget Circular No. A-76 that defines the work within a federal agency as inherently governmental or inherently commercial. This circular allows for the outsourcing of activities which are not defined as inherently governmental.) He believes this is a policy issue. Is NCPTT's work seen as an essentially government function or is it viewed as something that can be outsourced? He advised that the Center needs to be ready to compete. NCPTT must learn to work and live in an uncomfortable situation.

Budget related problems for NCPTT include:

1. attempting to function within the Federal system while the Center's funds are being moved in and out of the President's budget.
2. having a declining budget over the last eleven years while both operating and living costs have increased, and
3. operating in a defensive mode.

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) report, which was the basis for the formation of NCPTT, expected NCPTT to be funded at a much higher funding level that has never been realized.

Possible action: the Board could prepare an ideal budget as a reference.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that we must use caution. Any requested increases should not be tied to fixed expenses. While the Board may seek funding increases, no lobbying effort can effectively increase base funding. He emphasized that NCPTT must demonstrate added value over its eleven years. We may need to do some type of cost-benefit analysis. For example, the Heritage Education – Louisiana program is a huge benefit. Every congressional district has benefited by the existence of NCPTT.

Possible action: the staff could prepare a list of top ten reasons to invest in NCPTT.

The issue of the NPS Natural Resources Challenge was raised as a way the Park Service got Congress to invest new dollars in natural resource management. This successful initiative brought dollars into Universities for research within a specific time limit. No base staff was added, but the Challenge resulted in many new initiatives. Both the Natural Resource community and NCPTT are science-based initiatives.

Ms. Lewis brought up the fact that the NPS administration really needs NCPTT's knowledge base. For example, one of the most critical needs within NPS is the elimination of the maintenance backlog (mostly in historic structures). The administration needs a quantitative approach to asset management that includes mostly structures, historic structures, and cultural resources. NCPTT can provide the skill base to take care of NPS historic structures. But we can look farther within the Federal community. What about our assistance to federal agencies

like GSA, or the Department of Veteran Affairs? There are issues like security for historic buildings, or preservation of the recent past that NCPTT could address.

**Can the Business Plan Save the Center?** – A moderated discussion was led by Mr. Gallegos and Mr. Koonce. The current business plan, developed with the help of Mr. Richard Wagner, has taken much time and effort to create. This document may save us from the budget process. But it asks too much and foresees too much. We must consider NCPTT branding based on recognized excellence in our areas of effort. But NCPTT has been plagued with the “Be everything to all” problem. NCPTT must maintain definitive, clear-cut objectives. The industry looks to NCPTT. Based on the current business plan recommendations, does NCPTT have sufficient means to execute the plan?

Dr. Preusser believed that the main problem with the business plan is that the recommendations are too staff resource intensive to be feasible. For example, the fellowship program as proposed would require 5 – 10% staff time for each fellow brought in to the center. He recommended that we review and distill the business plan down taking into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of the staff. For example, the Cemetery Monument Conservation program and the Heritage Education – Louisiana initiative build on the strengths of the staff. Dr. Preusser thought that the business plan needs to be more opportunistic and draw from the recommendations of the staff.

Chair Silman asked the staff how we have used the business plan? Mr. Cordell explained that the plan has promoted more emphasis on cost recovery and has been used to set workshop fees. In addition, the business plan has been a source of targeted topics for development. He noted that Mr. Wagner projects that we can increase our budget by \$ 5 million in five years through the business plan. Dr. Striegel’s budget stream within the Materials Research Program of over \$200,000 this year demonstrates the Center’s ability to leverage and extend its funds, but still may not be entrepreneurial enough in some ways.

Mr. Koonce pointed out the need for analyzing the current strategic plan. He noted that the business plan and the strategic plan must fit hand in hand. He recommended that NCPTT contract a highly successful firm to develop a new strategic plan for NCPTT.

The Board noted that NCPTT is a center of excellence in both what it does and what it causes to happen. For example the PTT Grants Program leverages federal funds and drives research and training forward. The Center needs to be able to show that the grants program sets the direction for creating research dollars. Mr. Weiss pointed out that in Mr. Wagner’s business plan one does not see much about bringing the money into NCPTT (what are the mechanisms?). Mr. Weiss added that the Business Plan doesn’t give the “this is it” feel.

The Board felt that the Cemetery Monument Conservation Program and the Heritage Education Program are examples. But the Cemetery Monument Conservation Program is a cost recovery effort. It doesn’t produce added income. The Heritage Education Program is analogous to the National Trust’s Main Street program and could eventually generate funds off the top. Heritage Education – Louisiana Program was meant to serve as a national model, but what has been done to export this model to other states and how will this ultimately generate more income?



Based on his past federal experiences, Mr. Gallegos asked if NCPTT submits a strategic plan with its budget request. Currently, it is not the practice within NPS to submit a strategic plan. Mr. Cordell pointed out that we have drafted a new in-house strategic plan which incorporates GPRA language.

**The Lee H. Nelson Prize.** *The PTT Board proposed two activities that are Board generated and executed. They include the Lee H. Nelson Prize discussed in this section and a possible Wingspread conference discussed in a later section.* The concept of the Lee H. Nelson Prize grew out of the last Board meeting on Ellis Island, when the Board expressed interest in developing higher visibility for NCPTT. Mr. Tiller has assisted with the development of the concept, which is presented under tab 4 of the PTT Board report. Mr. Tiller has spoken with Ms. Lois Nelson, the wife of Mr. Nelson, who has agreed with the concept of a Nelson Prize.

Mr. Tiller noted that Lee Nelson was a founder of the Association for Preservation Technology International (APT) and a fellow of the American Institute for Architecture. He was instrumental in the NPS Heritage Preservation Services and developed the Preservation Brief Series. Mr. Nelson started in Philadelphia with NPS and was part of the group that included Penny Bachelor and Hugh Miller. He was an advocate of technology. The building in which we were meeting was named after him.

The Board identified many questions to be answered as we move forward with this concept. For example:

- What does the prize recognize and who is eligible?
- How will the prize be administered?
- How do we get started?
- How will the prize be funded? There may be funds within the Friends organization. Should those funds be used? The Center could award the prize in tandem with a professional meeting such as APT.

A clear set of guidelines are needed for the award. Mr. Weiss suggested that technology transfer was Mr. Nelson's passion. He liked taking information into Preservation and then putting it back out to the public (through publications). Perhaps a book prize with a monetary award should be considered. A donation system by which to raise the funds is needed. Mr. Weiss contended that book publishers would likely buy into this idea. Since Mr. Nelson created the Preservation Briefs, the award could also commission a new brief each year. The award could be sponsored by a commercial entity, such as a Prosoco-Lee Nelson award.

Mr. Graham suggested that other people could be honored – Charles Peterson, Martin Weaver, etc. through named fellows. The Board/Center then could ask for dollars to support those fellowships.

Mr. Weiss asked how many books are coming out in preservation technology? Not many. Is this a lifetime achievement or publication specific? The Board needs to work out these issues.

Additional questions were raised by Ms. Turner, including if it were an article or report, would NCPTT have to make it available? Is the award to an individual or to an institution? Should it be U.S. only or international? She suggested that we need to look at other awards that are given and see how their language is written. Additionally, a subcommittee is needed to clarify these issues and report back to the full Board. Sharon Park with the NPS Heritage



Preservation Services is very interested and eager to work with NCPTT on this proposal. She could be very instrumental in helping the Board develop a “Friends of Preservation” mailing list.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Weiss and Mr. Graham will serve as a Board subcommittee to develop the issues discussed into a Nelson Prize recommendation by the next Board meeting.

The Board must keep in mind that the award must promote the Center as well as the winner. Perhaps a medal with images on both sides could be developed as part of the award. The award must be part of the strategy and branding efforts of NCPTT.

**Schedule of Fall PTT Board meeting.** The next Board meeting will be scheduled in Santa Fe, New Mexico, from October 30 to November 2, 2005. (October 30 and November 2 will serve as travel days, the meeting will be held on October 31 and November 1, 2005. Travel arrangements will be made to travel through the Albuquerque airport.) The Center will look to regional organizations, such as the Southwest Parks Association, to assist in arrangements.

## **SURVIVAL OF THE CENTER**

**Actions necessary for the Center to survive.** The Board evaluated possible actions needed to ensure the survival of the NCPTT. The role of the Board as advisors to offer guidance was emphasized. This session of the Board meeting began with defining NCPTT’s constituents. Dr. Preusser noted that some of NCPTT’s most successful projects have grown out of regional efforts that were then expanded nationwide (i.e. the Cemetery Monument Conservation Workshops and the Heritage Education – Louisiana Program.) He elaborated that the constituents will vary by program area within NCPTT. Mr. Weiss offered that our constituency could be viewed as a series of ever larger concentric circles, like Dante’s Circles of Hell. For example, the innermost circle would be NPS. Moving away from the center would include other government agencies like GSA or the VA, then preservation groups, such as AIA, APT, AIC, etc.

Mr. Gallegos emphasized the need to serve NPS better in order to survive. Mr. Cordell noted that NCPTT follows Weiss’ model of constituencies’ layers. NCPTT focuses on preservation professionals as our main constituency. The Center does not develop programs that cater to the fringe constituencies, but it does answer questions and provide assistance to anyone who contacts the Center. It is clear that NCPTT is not well known in the NPS. Jeff Guin serves as NCPTT’s public information officer to help raise NCPTT’s profile to our constituents, including NPS. The Center has worked closely with the local constituency as well. NCPTT needs to be better recognized by NPS, but this is not a problem that NCPTT faces alone. For example, in a recent survey on Inside NPS, Park Service employees were asked to identify internal and external programs within Cultural Resources. Many could not correctly identify the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Register, and HABS/HAER, among others.

Ms. Lewis noted that NPS is about the parks. The parks can’t survive without the efforts of NCPTT. This Center ought to be about abundance to NPS. There are resources here that can serve NPS. Others agreed that NCPTT has unique expertise and NPS needs the expertise of



NCPTT. If the Center were on contract with every region of the NPS, it is doubtful that its budget would be zeroed out.

A question of NCPTT's six research priorities was brought up by Mr. Garrison. He noted that the six research priorities do not focus on topics onto which NPS can latch. He noted the need to define ourselves in one-page statements to defend NCPTT's existence. But what NCPTT does is far more complex than can be defined in one page. Mr. Koonce suggested that NCPTT needed to explore marketing research and offered that the AIA could assist NCPTT by hosting a symposium of different NCPTT constituencies, such as other NPS offices, GSA, etc., that could better help define the core needs NCPTT could address. Ms. O'Donnell pointed out that we needed to build on in-house expertise.

Possible ACTION ITEM: AIA and NCPTT to host a consortium of 100 core constituents at the AIA office in Washington DC.

Next, the Board discussed the location of NCPTT within the NPS budget. There are two main budget categories – ONPS (for Operations of the National Park Service) and NR&P (for National Recreation and Preservation). NCPTT is currently funded through the NR&P budget category. But parks, which have more stable funding, are funded through ONPS. Would NCPTT be in a more stable condition if some or all of its funding were out of ONPS? There are work-related implications associated with each funding source. For example, ONPS funds are more focused on park activities while NR&P is more outward looking. There are other "National Centers" within the NPS but we are the only one funded on the NR&P side of the budget.

Possible ACTION ITEM: Investigate the potential of and implications for moving some or all of NCPTT's funding to the ONPS side of the NPS budget. Does this require new legislation? What are the implications? What are the market niches?

A third area of discussion focused on some things that NCPTT could do for the National Park Service. For example, maintenance is a huge issue within NPS. Nothing progressive has been done in this area. Ms. Lewis pointed out that more and more projects are contracted to the private sector, which drives a need for well-informed NPS project managers. Is NPS getting the best qualified contractors, capable of doing the work correctly? Within the NPS, Project Manager is the only growth job and positions are needed both at the regional and park levels. Mr. Weiss suggested that NCPTT could develop materials courses and conservation workshops for NPS Project Managers. Some courses could be developed for on-line computer-based delivery, since travel funds are in short supply. Other activities would require the use of labs, library, training facilities, and conference rooms that could be provided by NCPTT's special facilities.

Ms. O'Donnell led the discussion on a fourth item – the language of NCPTT's annual report. She noted that the current titles do not actively or compellingly define the work of NCPTT. For example, the title, Materials Research, does not reflect the wide range of activities from research, to convener, to trainer, taking place within this program.

ACTION ITEM: NCPTT will edit its 2004 annual report using more active language to reflect the nature of its work. Suggested titles may include: Advances in Materials, New Training, Enhanced Access, or Model Programs.

A fifth area of discussion focused on means to bring in capital to NCPTT. For example, what is the best way for NCPTT to distribute and receive funding for publications, training, research activities, etc.? Does NCPTT need to partner with someone like Eastern National? Does it have enough outside support to start the NCPTT Institute? This would be a separate institute with 501 (C) 3 status. The institute could serve NCPTT by receiving funds through consulting fees, certification program fees, grants, etc. The new institute could serve as a cooperating association through an agreement with NCPTT.

**Partnerships.** Mr. Graham led the discussion on NCPTT's partnerships. He asked the Board to define how NCPTT can best leverage its research dollars. The first point of discussion focused on current partnerships and the expansion of programs to meet national needs. Through training opportunities such as the Summer Institute, the NCPTT Summer Internship program, the Cemetery Monument Conservation training, and Heritage Education -- Louisiana, the Center continually develops potential new partnerships. Board members were interested in seeing the Heritage Education -- Louisiana program exported to other neighboring states in order to fulfill a more national mandate and to develop a greater Congressional constituency.

The recipients of PTT grants are a second group of potential partners for NCPTT. Should NCPTT consider awarding grants more strategically? And how effectively does NCPTT attempt to develop or sustain partnerships after grants are completed? One dilemma is the dwindling funds available for NCPTT to award as grants. As operational costs have increased, NCPTT has seen a decrease in discretionary funds. The net result is fewer and fewer grants awarded. Once the funds drop below a critical level, there are fewer applicants for the same pool of funds. In addition, the restaffing of NCPTT's management positions and the addition of unfunded mandates such as the Heritage Education -- Louisiana program is signaling the death of the grants program. One hope is to move to requiring matching funds. At least this leverages the available federal funding from \$400,000 towards \$1.2 million.

Dr. Striegel suggested that NCPTT's partnerships be seen similar to investment portfolios. A balanced variety of partnerships are needed to best use federal funds. She asked that the Board consider developing criteria to select partners and to determine the balance of the partners strategically.

**Wingspread Conference.** Chair Silman led a discussion of developing a conference as a predominantly Board activity. The issue was first raised at the Board meeting on Ellis Island. One possible location for a Board conference is the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin. The Conference Center is run by the Wingspread Johnson Foundation and has complete resources needed to facilitate conferences. The Board must prepare a proposal for the Foundation to consider.

The Board seemed to be in general agreement that it had come of age to be able to handle such a venture, but what is the best topic and location? One topic suggested for the conference is the relationship between sustainability and preservation. Alternate venues discussed included Gordon Conferences, the Nantucket Institute, or Middleton Inn outside of Charleston. Concern was expressed that these other locations might not be able to provide the support mechanisms offered by Wingspread.



The conference would be limited in size to approximately 40 participants invited from various fields with expertise in the area of sustainability. In addition, some key philanthropic representatives may be invited (Kress foundation, Mellon Foundation, etc.). The participants would be divided into four to five work groups, based on NCPTT program areas. The length of the conference is debatable, but should include an introduction with two to three keynote speakers. Reading assignments would be developed and sent in advance. There were several different types of results discussed. They included a Charter, an extensive bibliography, and a brochure or booklet on the topic of sustainability and preservation.

**ACTION ITEM:** The Board formed a subcommittee to continue development of the Wingspread conference idea. The committee consists of Dr. Preusser, Ms. Turner, and Chair Silman.

**NCPTT and the National Park Service – White Grass Ranch.** Mr. Tiller provided an update on progress for the planned Western Center for Preservation Technology and Training (WCPTT) to be located at Whitegrass Ranch in Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming. One supporter of this potential new center is the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which promised to raise \$1 million in funds to develop the ranch and the center. The Whitegrass Ranch consists of about 13 buildings which are slated for rehabilitation. The concept of the WCPTT is more similar to NPS's Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) located in Frederick, Maryland. The emphasis is on hands-on preservation.

The WCPTT received a \$2.5 million appropriation. Rather than a duplication of NCPTT, it may be seen as complimentary. There may be possibilities to share resources. Opportunities may include sharing staff and helping to share and build the direction of this program. Also, since there is no proposal for an advisory board for WCPTT, this PTT Board may be of great assistance to the new organization. The greatest concern expressed by the PTT Board was the closeness between the names of the two organizations.

### **Meeting Wrap-up –**

**NCPTT Strategic Plan.** The Board revisited the issue of NCPTT's strategic plan and expressed the desire that NCPTT have a simple, straight-forward strategic plan. Mr. Cordell reminded the Board that an in-house strategic plan was developed by the staff at a staff retreat in 2004. The Board will review the plan developed by the staff and provide comments.

**Motion:** Mr. Graham introduced a motion that the Board consider Norman Koonce's offer for the American Institute of Architecture to host a marketing focus group for NCPTT at the AIA headquarters in Washington, DC. Mr. Weiss seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously.

**Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.